

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application and for the helpful interview conducted on March 23, 2010 (summarized below). Reconsideration is now respectfully requested in view of the amendment above and the following remarks.

Claims 21-24, 26-30, 32 and 36-46 are pending in this application. Claims 21 and 36 are independent claims. Claims 21, 24, 30, 36, 37, 42, and 43 are amended. Claims 1-20, 31 and 33-35 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claim 25 is currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Again, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview conducted on March 23, 2010. This interview was conducted telephonically between Examiner Steven Kim and Applicant's undersigned representative. The first topic of discussion was the use of the Daniels reference in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (see below for details of rejections). The Examiner explained that Daniels was being relied upon solely to teach timing considerations. The Examiner then discussed a further embodiment of the invention, relating to paragraphs [0025]-[0028] of the application as originally filed, which might be allowable over the cited references. No agreement was reached, however.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities, for example, for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant has reviewed the claim language and the specification and believes that the claim language is adequately supported by the specification. With regard to the specific claim language objected to:

- 1) “Video processing equipment” is supported throughout the application. For example, video processing equipment is shown in the accompanying Fig. 1. It is also described, e.g., in paragraph [0019] (e.g., “a processing unit adapted for processing...any digital video stream”).
- 2) Similarly, “means for permitting a user to access a burned DVD...” is also supported throughout the application. Examples of support may be found, e.g., in Fig. 1 and at paragraphs [0019] (e.g., “physical distribution channel (e.g., CD-ROM or DVD)”), [0025] (e.g., “recorded on a physical support that equipment 2 can read such as, e.g., a DVD”), [0026] (e.g., “burning a physical support 22”), [0028] (e.g., “The user then inserts physical support 22 into reader 32...”), and [0032] (e.g., “The format of physical support 22...is advantageously in the DVD format.”).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 21-30, 32 and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to Claim 21, particularly amending the second occurrence of “a selection” to “the selection.” In view of that amendment, which Applicant believes addresses this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 21-30, 32-33 and 36-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 to Ginter (hereinafter “Ginter”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0413807 to Komatsu (hereinafter “Komatsu”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0100052 to Daniels (hereinafter “Daniels”). The rejection of Claim

25 is rendered moot by its cancellation. This rejection is respectfully traversed, with respect to the other claims, for at least the following reasons.

Applicant has now amended Claim 21 to recite, “distributing the main stream to the user in response to the selection by the user, wherein distributing comprises furnishing the user with a physical support medium on which the main stream is stored” and “receiving information from the user’s equipment upon initiation of viewing the main stream stored on the physical support medium,” among other things. Claim 36 has been similarly amended. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and has found no teachings or suggestions of such features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not support rejections of Claims 21 and 36 and their dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claims 21-24, 26-30, 32-33 and 36-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicant may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-01124-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Jeffrey W. Gluck/
Jeffrey W. Gluck
Registration No.: 44,457
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 572-0322 (Direct Dial)
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant